



**Executive Committee Meeting
February 28, 2002
Draft - Meeting Summary**

The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.

Executive Committee members present:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Kargianis
Chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Rob McKenna
King County Council | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Mathis
FHWA |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sants Contreras (Alt.)
City of Kirkland | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Horn
WA State Senate | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Margarita Prentice
WA State Senate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie Marshall
City of Bellevue | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Edwards
PSRC | <input type="checkbox"/> Randy Corman
City of Renton |
| <input type="checkbox"/> John Okamoto
WSDOT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rosemarie Ives
City of Redmond | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Mullet
City of Tukwila |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dick Paylor
City of Bothell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan McBride
City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grant Degginger (Alt.)
City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonny Putter
City of Newcastle | <input type="checkbox"/> Pam Carter (Alt.)
City of Tukwila | <input type="checkbox"/> Aubrey Davis (Alt.)
WSTC |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Dye (Alt.)
WSDOT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dave Gossett
Snohomish County | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Sax
Snohomish County |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cheryl Pflug
WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Christopher Hurst
WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Paine (Alt.)
City of Redmond |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Julia Patterson (Alt.)
WA State Senate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harold Taniguchi
King County | <input type="checkbox"/> Tim Olsen
City of Bothell |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chuck Mosher
Sound Transit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandra Meyer
City of Renton | |

Staff and Observers

Johannes Kurz, Steering Committee
Larry Springer, Mayor, City of Kirkland
Mary Alyce Burleigh, Citizen Committee
Bruce Nurse, Kemper Development
Chris Johnson, King County Council
Kevin Shively, Transportation Choices
Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue

Corrine Hensley, Citizen Committee
Peter Beaulieu, PSRC
Nick Afzali, City of Renton

Project Management Team

Mike Cummings, WSDOT
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental
Ron Anderson, DEA
Craig Stone, WSDOT
Rita Brogan, PRR

Christina Martinez, WSDOT
Ann Martin, King County
Paul Bergman, PRR
Fen Hsiao, PRR
Brian O'Sullivan, Sound Transit

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman George Kargianis called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. He welcomed public comments or observations. There was no public comment.

Chairman Kargianis asked for comments on or approval of the February 28, 2002 meeting summary. There were no corrections. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairman Kargianis reviewed the meeting agenda:

- Program Update and Next Steps
- Funding and Phasing Concept
- Preferred Alternative Refinements
- Executive Committee Roles and Responsibilities & Funding/Phasing Subcommittee Report
- Environmental Mitigation Plan Overview

Chairman Kargianis turned the meeting over to Program Manager Michael Cummings, WSDOT.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Future Executive Committee Meetings Schedule:

March 28 moved to April 2*

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Kirkland City Hall

****New Date***

Mr. Cummings noted that the meeting has been moved from March 28 to April 2 per the committee's request. He asked if the new date works for everyone. Paul Bergman, PRR, said this was the date everyone had previously approved via e-mail.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Winter Speakers Bureau:

- Renton Transportation Comm.: Jan. 17
- King Country Employee Trans.: Feb. 7
- SW KC Chamber of Commerce: Feb 8
- King County Council Trans. Comm.: Feb. 27
- Wilburton Hill Neighborhood Assoc.: Postponed
- Renton Committee of the Whole: March 4
- Woodinville Chamber of Commerce: March 21

Mr. Cummings noted Sandra Meyer, City of Renton, testified at the King County Employee Transportation Committee briefing.

Chairman Kargianis asked what kind of reception the program has been receiving.

Mr. Cummings said the Renton Committee was particularly interested in the additional lanes issues. The reception was supportive based on the guarantee that WSDOT provides data supporting the elements. He said staff would continue to meet with Renton's City Council. Ms. Meyer agreed that the council is supportive of the program. She noted that the President of the Kenndale Neighborhood Association is concerned about alignment in that area. The main concern is that WSDOT must demonstrate the benefit of taking homes out and the affects the program will have to the area. Ms. Meyer said that otherwise, the council is very supportive.

Chairman Kargianis said that community outreach is critical to the program.

Craig Stone, WSDOT, said the King County Employee Transportation presentation was also generally supportive. He said they were interested in TDM. SW King County Chamber of Commerce was also very supportive. He noted that Mayor Mullet was present. The chamber was especially interested in the SR 167/ I-405 interchange area.

Mr. Cummings said the King County Council Transportation Committee asked difficult questions about the issues surrounding I-405 and link light rail will need to be addressed as the program moves into implementation.

Chairman Kargianis announced that Connie Marshall, City of Bellevue, would like to recognize the newly nominated Sound Transit representative, Chuck Mosher, Bellevue City Council, later in the meeting. Ms. Marshall said Mr. Mosher is planning to attend the meeting but had a PSRC conflict so would be arriving late. She noted that Rob McKenna, who is visiting Washington D.C., has previously been serving as the committee's vice-chair and Sound Transit representative. She motioned to retain Vice-chair McKenna as the committee's vice-chair. The motion was seconded.

Chairman Kargianis said Vice-chair McKenna has made an excellent contribution to the program and said he is in favor of the motion. Bob Edwards, PSRC, said Vice-chair McKenna is also the Chairman of TIB and that the committee needs a representative from that board, as well.

The committee unanimously voted to keep Vice-chair McKenna as the vice-chairman of the committee, representing TIB.

Chairman Kargianis also congratulated Harold Taniguchi, King County, who was recently named Director of King County Transportation.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Road to the Record of Decision:

January

- Environmental Program: approach, goals, objectives
- Preferred Alternative: Refine
- Phasing & Funding: Begin discussion

February

- Environmental Program: Draft mitigation concept
- Phasing and funding concepts development
- Draft Concurrence Point #3

March/April

- Environmental Program: Conceptual mitigation plan
- Phasing and funding concept development
- Concurrence Point #3 & PFEIS

April/May: Publish FEIS

June/July: Record of Decision

Mr. Cummings said they are aiming for a Concurrence Point 3 at the end of March. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Stone to provide a Legislative Update.

Legislative Update: Situation Fluid but Optimistic:

- Several bills have passed out of House and Senate; differences will be addressed in Conference Committee.
- Outstanding issues:
 - Decision making structure
 - Timing for public vote
- What have you heard?

Mr. Stone said the program has had more visibility over the last few weeks. Staff has issued some cost information. He said House Democrats are talking about a June 20 vote. Staff is trying to provide information to as many different bodies as possible. He asked the committee members if they have any legislative updates they would like to add.

Chairman Kargianis asked if the House passed out a budget. Sonny Putter, City of Newcastle, said they are expected to pass it out tomorrow. He said that per an Eastside representative who called him yesterday, his opinion is that it will be primarily party line votes. He said he thinks amendments will be proposed on the floor but doesn't know the details. He said it's still up in the air on what will emerge statewide. There have been discussions behind the scene between the Senate and House negotiators on the regional bill that will probably have more of an affect on I-405.

Mr. Stone said WSDOT has heard a \$700 million figure with \$1.5 billion for regional projects. Mr. Putter said he has not received regional information but is encouraged to hear the Senate and House are talking and trying to converge on a regional bill. He said, statewide, they are talking about a May vote.

Chairman Kargianis asked where the Senate's transportation bill is. Mr. Putter said he has been told the Senate has problems with the House Majority bill that emerged from the committee yesterday.

David Dye, WSDOT, said the Senate is also working on its own package with a possible action as early as Saturday. Mr. Putter said the implication is that it's either going to happen next week or not at all. However, they expect it to happen.

Chairman Kargianis welcomed Chuck Mosher, Sound Transit, upon his arrival.

Mr. Stone said reviewed the Cost and Budget:

1. Corridor Planning
 - DEIS Estimate - based on Alt 3 Scope
 - FEIS Estimate - based on PA Scope
2. Budgeting/Programming
 - Implementation Plan / Funding Plan
3. Legislative Funding/Public Vote
 - Set budget for set project scope
 - When is a cost a budget?
 - Answer: Not yet!
 - 1% design = Planning Level
 - Cost are done for comparison purposes only, but are done to best capture the probable cost
 - Represent 2000 dollars not inflated dollars

Mr. Stone said that under usual circumstances the program would be moving from one element to the next but this project is progressing through the elements simultaneously. He said staff is working on a funding plan with the sub committee. Scope and budget and schedule will all affect each other. He said the costs have only been completed for comparison purposes between the alternatives.

Mr. Kargianis asked what funding the program has obtained to date. Mr. Stone said they have a \$10.5 million budget right now. \$1.5 million is for the current effort. 1/3 of the funding is for the base map, 1/3 for implementation and staff and 1/3 for the general engineering consultant.

Chairman Kargianis asked if the funding has been approved by the legislature. Mr. Dye said it has all been approved. Chairman Kargianis asked if \$17 million has been committed so far. Mr. Dye said \$6.5 million has been spent and the program is in the process of spending the remainder.

Project Estimating 101:

- How are estimates usually done?
 - Why won't that work for mega-projects?
- What do we need to do to get a good estimate?
 - Need a reliable cost estimating / validation process
- For mega-projects must evaluate risk and variability using statistical (probability) methods

Mr. Stone said Mr. Dye has already presented this estimating process to the Viaduct committee and Mr. Stone is planning on giving it to the SR-509 committee. He said staff is using research and the national perspective to deal with how to manage risk.

Variability of Cost:

- The actual cost of a project is subject to many variables, which significantly influence the range of "probable projected cost":
Therefore, any single cost number represents only one possible result depending on the variables and assumptions.
- These variables are not all directly controllable or absolutely quantifiable:
Therefore, the cost estimating process must consider probabilities in estimating cost, using a recognized, logical and tested process

How are Estimates Usually Done:

- Planning
 - "Top Down"
 - Cost per mile
 - ID Order of Magnitude
- Environmental
 - "Top Down" or Mix "Top Down" & "Bottom Up"
 - Cost per mile & some unit costs/quantities
 - Comparison Purposes
- Engineering
 - "Bottom Up"
 - Unit Cost & Quantities
 - Basis for Bid Comparison & Analysis
 - Based on Specific Schedule & Construction Phasing
 - Risk Identified and Assigned

Why Won't That Work for This Project?

We won't have the flexibility to handle cost & schedule variation like we have in past projects and programs:

- Public vote
 - Scope commitment
 - Schedule commitment
 - Cost commitment
- Size and scale of mega-projects

Chairman Kargianis said that every project has variables, how is this program different? Is it because the I-405 program is seeking a discreet sum therefore it doesn't have flexibility? Mr. Stone said that if they look at the next 10 years, there

are many little projects as well as mega projects. Little projects may have unknown direction and cost run-ups but will be balanced out by another project that is under-cost. So, the programs for these projects are pretty accurate. However, if there is a bump in a mega project, they don't have room for cost variables because even little differences cost a lot. Mr. Stone said the question is how can staff estimate for unknown problems. How do we manage risk?

Mr. Stone said with many projects, staff is familiar with the details from past experience and there is not a lot of risk. However, this project has many risks, especially because it is a pilot project. He emphasized the need for all involved to be focused on this issue.

Mr. Mosher said the program may not have tunneling, but they have the same environmental requirements.

How Do We Get to Good Estimate?

- Integrate Planning, Environmental & Engineering Processes
- Advance Key Engineering Items
 - High Risk
- Identify & quantify items that also affect project cost:
 - Politics
 - Environmental
 - Schedule & Phasing

Mr. Stone said the program needs to identify the high-risk areas and how to manage them. He said environmental commitments are strong in Seattle and the guidelines are constantly evolving.

Two Key Actions:

First:

Develop a cost estimating and validation process to ensure that cost estimates are reasonable, defensible and sustainable

Second:

Implement project and program management systems to ensure on-time, on-budget delivery of Mega Projects.

Cost Estimate and Validation Process:

WSDOT is now developing a uniform Cost Estimate Validation Process (CEVP)

- Peer Review Panel of Experts (National)
- Review Project Cost Estimates
- Identify High Risk Project Items
- Develop Protocols to Enhance Estimating Practices
- Introduce Risk, Variability, and Statistical Probability into Estimating

Mr. Stone said WSDOT is taking a hard look at each mega project across the state and running them through the CEVP to obtain the cost information before the public vote. He said WSDOT would try and run the projects through the process this spring. This will be the framework for the information staff will give out when asked about the cost estimate and Sound Transit experience.

Key Project Requirements:

Public understanding and acceptance of the project

- Ability to set realistic budget
and schedule
- Funding - availability, stability

- Ability to meet budget and schedule

Mr. Stone said the Budget and Schedule is part of his duties. He said they are using the Boston project for "lessons learned."

Mr. Stone reviewed the Public's Investment in the project. He said the further staff gets into engineering and definition the closer they are to knowing cost.

Mr. Putter asked what the basis is for determining each discreet cost. Mr. Stone said they are going through a one-week exercise with each team and looking at risk elements and how valid the assumptions are. He said both national and local teams are looking at the program in terms of environmental regulations, political issues, etc. and will be putting the information into a model.

Mr. Dye said this process would change the way WSDOT develops its estimate. In the past, they have been able to build in contingencies. Historically, the estimate tends to be toward the low side because they weren't experienced enough with funding instability, political support and environmental regulations. Mr. Dye said this process has begun to open WSDOT's thinking. They will have an estimate but will also look at the range of variation considering all these other factors.

Mr. Dye said this process allows decision makers to come up with more educated numbers for the ballot. He said there would be some language in the cost estimate about "plus and minus 20 percent." Chairman Kargianis asked if there are any provisions for going back for more funding. Mr. Dye said there is some recognition that costs can change for the project. However, WSDOT wants to make sure the number is as close to accurate as possible. Chairman Kargianis agreed that the number has to be as accurate as possible for a public vote.

Ms. Marshall said that before the project can receive funding, they have to have PSRC approval. What is the timing for this committee to help this process? She advised that PSRC isn't up to speed as of now. Mr. Dye said that staff is going to make a mega projects presentation to the PSRC in March.

Mr. Stone said staff is working with them on the I-405 program and will have a follow-up meeting in March. He said they are working with staff to move the program from candidate status to approval status at the end of March. Mr. Cummings said that for PSRC to sign off on the EIS, the program has to be in the air quality model. He said they need to make an adjustment in March, and then can move the project from candidate to approved.

Ms. Marshall said the Executive Board is sometimes made up of members who don't sit on either committee. Should there be a joint meeting between the transportation and growth management boards? She said that neither board understands that this project supports land management. Chairman Kargianis asked staff to make sure a presentation is made to the Executive Board.

Mr. Putter said staff needs to document where the program is in the environmental process and that it's consistent with all plans, not just local jurisdiction plans, but all plans. He warned that the program needs to be consistent with these plans or else it will be in trouble with the PSRC. Chairman Kargianis asked staff to provide the committee with some input.

Rosemarie Ives, City of Redmond, said that she attended the meeting and there were concerns with the I-405 program being consistent with the PSRC Growth

Management guidelines. She said staff needs to give a presentation to both the Transportation Board and the Growth Management Committees. She warned that representatives voiced great concern that the I-405 program was consistent with PSRC principals. She said she doesn't think staff should approach the Executive Board directly because it will probably want the two other committees to deal with it anyway. Chairman Kargianis suggested talking to all three committees. Ms. Ives said this would be good.

Mr. Mosher said a presentation needs to be given to Sound Transit as well because they may not be up to speed or may have misconceptions about the program. Chairman Kargianis agreed. Mr. Stone said staff has given a presentation to the Sound Transit board and is are now talking about the process needed to achieve Sound Transit's full support.

Chairman Kargianis said there is a need for additional communication with various supporting committees.

Mr. Mosher said staff should think of how I-405 ties in with regional efforts. They need to get decision makers up to speed as well as those who can affect decision makers over time. He said there is a big gap between what we know and what the general public knows and that can affect decision makers.

Ms. Ives said the information sent out to the public in the latest newsletter is misleading. She said she has not yet had the opportunity to send a letter of record, but believes the information regarding BRT in the brochure is misleading. She said the program isn't practicing pure BRT and therefore shouldn't send out information that intentionally misleads the public about the program's BRT proposals. She said the brochure isn't truthful and wanted to go on record as saying so.

Mr. Stone reviewed the The Cost Number:

- Any cost number represents only one possible final result
 - I-405 Corridor Program is at 1% Engineering
- It is dependent on many variables and assumptions

Mr. Stone reviewed the Model Result Spectrum. He said they need to reduce the gaps between variables to get the most accurate cost estimate.

He said that staff has 95 percent of the I-405 Preferred Alternative well defined for.

I-405 Preferred Alternative Refinements:

On November 16, 2001 the Executive Committee selected Alternative #3, and added specific elements to the Preferred Alternative

- Environmental and cost analysis of that decision is being conducted
- Proposed Refinements:
 - Direct Access
 - Arterials from Alt. 4

Refinement Options:

- 1.Include added Elements in Preferred Alternative:
 - *FEIS analysis underway; current PMT direction*
- 2.Not include added Elements in Preferred Alternative:
 - *Possible schedule implications*

Mr. Stone said that staff recommends including the added elements in the preferred alternative cost estimate. He said that the Steering Committee had been given the option to include direct access for analysis purposes. But cost for this was only

included in the "needing further study" numbers. He said that the Steering Committee didn't understand why staff didn't include it in the cost of study. Staff received direction from the Steering Committee that this approach was too confusing so they are going with including all the estimated costs of the refinements in the preferred alternative.

Mr. Putter asked if staff was introducing a bias between the 1st and 2nd choice. He emphasized the importance in taking a conservative approach. Mr. Stone said the conservative approach would be to include the elements.

Mr. Putter asked if the staff's natural bias is to go one way or another when making refinements. Mr. Stone said that at this point, with recommendations from the committees, these are the estimates staff will place in each component.

Preliminary Cost Estimates:

DEIS \$6.8 billion (Year 2000)
\$7.1 billion (Year 2002)

Funding Breakdown:

- \$4.6 billion Freeway
- \$1.0 billion HOV Components
- \$0.6 billion Transit
- \$0.6 billion Arterials

Ms. Marshall asked if the number include the HOV lane with 4-foot buffers in the barrier. Mr. Stone said the 4-foot buffer was added to Alternative 3 cost estimate.

Chairman Kargianis said he is disturbed by Ms. Ives comments regarding the public brochure. He requested that staff take time to sit down with Ms. Ives to discuss her concern regarding the brochure's description of BRT and report back to the committee. He said that he, himself, doesn't see an intentional misrepresentation with the BRT information.

Time value of money slides:

	<u>Total Program</u>
2000 Dollars	\$6.8 B*
2002 Dollars	7.1
10 Year Program	8.5
18 Year Program	9.3

Freeway:

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>Cost \$</u>
ALTERNATIVE #3	\$4.6 B

PROPOSED PA REFINEMENTS

SR 520 Interchange	+\$195M
Bellevue Vic. Mainline	- \$200M

PA ADDITIONS

Managed Lanes	+\$200 M
Added Lanes SR 167	+\$45 M w/ \$8 M EIS/study
Added Aux Lanes S. of I-90	+\$150 M

Total: +\$390 M

Mr. Stone said that the Managed Lanes element includes the 4-foot buffer. He said staff looked at where this element makes sense. However, they are limited on walls. He said that \$8 million is allotted for the Renton to Tacoma area to undertake a corridor study of SR 167. Mr. Putter asked if the \$8 million represents the additional cost of an environmental study that expands the boundaries of program due to the affect of adding lanes. Mr. Stone said the costs cover the area from Renton to Tacoma that were not included in the I-405 program since they had to logically end the study area boundary at some point on the map.

Mr. Putter asked if they are expanding the scope of the project. Mr. Stone said this segment would become its own identity apart from the I-405 project. He said they need to have logic for extra lanes and the segment needs its own approach and analysis. Mr. Putter asked if this puts the I-405 program in danger of a scoping problem that will put them in the same position as other projects that don't know where to stop. Mr. Dye said there has been a significant amount of interest in looking at a separate project for the SR 167 corridor.

Mr. Putter said it's important to recognize that I-405 and SR 167 are connected and the preferred alternative will have benefits to South King County. However, he said he doesn't want to pay for a project that keeps expanding. Mr. Dye said this is clearly a separate project. \$8 million covers the end of the I-405 project to Tacoma. The project would be funded independently.

Transit and HOV:

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>Cost \$</u>
ALTERNATIVE #3	1.0 + 0.6 = \$1.6 billion
<u>PROPOSED PA REFINEMENTS</u>	
BRT Stations: Consistent with service concept	+\$70 M
Reduced Service Increase (100% to 70% increase More than 2007)	- \$46 M
<u>PA ADDITIONS</u>	
Added Transit Centers: Lynnwood, Woodinville, Newcastle, Tukwila, Canyon Park	+\$75 M
New HOV Direct Access: Bothell Area Interchange Port Quendall South Renton/Tukwila Area	+\$261 M
Total: +\$360 M	

Mr. Dye noted that the project would have issues with transit operating and maintenance costs in terms of phasing, completion and funding. He asked if the sub committee is talking about this issue? Mr. Stone said the sub committee is talking about the issue and looking at what the program's existing sources are. He said they are also looking at operation and maintenance costs.

Mr. Cummings said the legislature needs to hear that transit operating and maintenance are critical elements in a transportation project. Mr. Stone said the regional bill allows for some capital costs but doesn't know if it allows for operational costs.

Mr. Putter said that funding for the program isn't just coming from statewide regional bills. He said there is also significant existing authority in Phase Two of Sound Move. He said funding from Sound Move could be available for both BRT operations and connecting bus operations as well as capital. He said there needs to be a recognition that funding is from the legislature and existing authority and that it just needs to be cobbled together.

Arterials:

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>Cost \$</u>
ALTERNATIVE #3	\$0.6 billion
<u>PROPOSED PA REFINEMENTS</u>	
Arterial Revisions/Adjustments	-\$90 M
<u>PROPOSED PA ADDITIONS</u>	
Expand N/S Arterials (from alt. 4)	+\$130 M
Willows Rd- NE 116 th to NE 124 th	
SR 202 – NE 106 th to NE 145 th	
SR 527 – SR 522 to 228 th	
SR-181 – S 180 th to S 200 th	
SR-181 – S 144 th to Grady Way	
Southcenter Pkwy – Tukwila Pkwy to Strander Blvd.	
	Total: +40 M

Mr. Stone said that the proposed PA additions are prime candidates for TIB funding. Also, the state roads will probably be funded by the state.

Potential Cost Impacts of Refinements:**1. Corridor Planning:**

–Pre. Preferred Alt.	\$7.1B 2000
–FEIS Estimate	\$7.5B 2000
	\$7.8B 2002

2. Budgeting/Programming:

–Implementation Plan / Funding Plan	
• Cost Estimate Verification	May 2002
• GEC Independent Analysis	Spring/Summer 2002
• MOU	Summer 2002

3. Legislative Funding/Public Vote?

Mr. Stone said the cost estimate verification date has been moved from May to March in light of the possible May vote. He said that the idea of a whole vision instead of just one project is important for the MOU. Chairman Kargianis asked if they would continue to refine cost estimates and continue to look for savings. He said these refinements are necessary but doesn't want to get to the point where they will get criticized for a growing cost estimate.

Mr. Stone said DEA has been conservative in their approach. Scope elements and management will be key. He said it's particularly important for this group to manage scope. The MOU will set a baseline of expectations.

Mr. O' Sullivan said that staff needs to represent operation and maintenance costs at some point in the costing refinements for transit. Mr. Stone said they would represent the numbers.

I-405 Implementation Components:**Shared Responsibility:**

- Park & Rides
- TDM
- HOV Lanes
- Direct Access
- Transit Centers

Mr. Stone said they are working with staff to get a better definition of transit service and shared responsibility roles.

Funding and Phasing Subcommittee Report:

Subcommittee met on February 1 and discussed:

- Legislative status
- Key messages
- Need for detailed cost and potential funding sources information
- WSDOT cost estimate and verification process
- Developing integrated funding plan that includes transit sources

Funding and Phasing Sub Committee Next Steps:

Package transit, roadway and local components into integrated implementation and funding plan.

Chairman Kargianis asked what "package" means. Mr. Stone said that I-509 put together a funding plan that identified the roles between partners. Everyone agreed to it and the Executive Committee signed it and WSDOT has been using it as the background for communicating the funding plan. He said staff would like a similar package for the I-405 program.

Exec Committee Roles and Responsibilities:

- Interest expressed in continued participation post Record of Decision
- Transition to implementation phase:
 - Program advocacy; guidance on phasing and funding plan and implementation issues
 - Move to quarterly meetings; regular information distributed to members
- Discuss at April 2nd meeting with Secretary of Transportation

Mr. Stone said they the committee has discussed this issue before and staff has recommended the committee move into the next phase. He said staff sees a need for the committee to provide direction and continue to play an advocacy role while looking at scope elements and phasing/prioritization. Staff also sees the need for the Executive Committee to provide guidance to implanting agencies.

Mr. Stone said Vice-chair McKenna has requested that the next meeting be a transition between EIS work and the next phase. He said if the committee continues, the meetings will be less frequent and there will be more communication via email but staff doesn't want to lose the momentum and guidance the committee has been providing. Mr. Putter said the sub committee recommended the need for this program to have champions to move the program ahead. He said this was the same message Vice-chair McKenna voiced to Secretary Doug MacDonald when they met last week.

Mr. Stone reviewed the Updated Executive Committee Charter:

The Executive Committee will provide vision, guidance and advocacy for the implementation of the I-405 Corridor Program.

- Attend or be represented at all Committee meetings;
- Identify issues vital to the project;
- Provide strategic recommendations to the project team;
- Assure opportunities for public, business, and civic group involvement
- Support the budget and schedule objectives of the program;
- Represent and report on program activities;

- Represent the governments and agencies they belong to and assist in building/maintaining a regional consensus;
- Help resolve conflicts between governments and agencies;
- Support implementation of the adopted strategy.

Mr. Stone said the charter was developed by the committee at the start of the program. He said the charter includes some ideas and descriptions to give the members a clear understanding of their expectations and roles. The list also lets the committee know when its job is complete. Chairman Kargianis asked if staff has the Power Point presentation they will be giving to the agencies. Mr. Stone said yes.

Rita Brogan, PRR, said that any member who wants a charter could get a copy from her.

Chairman Kargianis gave the committee a short break. Chairman Kargianis called the meeting back to order at 10:40 p.m.

Mr. Cummings reviewed **I-405 Mitigation Concept:**
Corridor Environmental Program:

- 1.Goal(s)
- 2.Objectives
- 3.Early Action Approach (by reference)

Mr. Cummings said staff is working with the sub committee to develop a mitigation program. The three components will be in the concurrence form.

Agreement Process:

- Concurrence Point 3
- Adoption of Plans and Programs
- Memorandum of Understanding

Mr. Putter asked when the concurrence would be due. Mr. Cummings said they are anticipating for it to go out in mid-to-late March. He said they are asking for a two-week turnaround but are anticipating some agencies will take longer.

Contents of Interagency Concurrence for the I-405 Program:

Concur/Agree:

- 1.Preferred Alternative and Mitigation Concept
- 2.Pursue adoption of plans and programs to implement the I-405 Corridor Program and
- 3.Not to revisit previous Concurrences unless there is substantial new information or substantial changes occur.

Environmental Briefings Conducted:

- 1000 FOW, Trans. Choices, NWF: Feb. 5
- Mountains to Sound: Feb. 6
- Municipal League: Feb. 11
- Move on 405: Feb. 20
- Bicycle Alliance: TBD
- League of Women Voters: March 5
- More being scheduled

Elements and Schedule:

- February
 - Informal agreement on Concurrence (Goals, Objectives, Early Action)

- March: Concurrence form distributed for signature
- April/May: Final EIS complete and concurrence forms returned

Goals:

1. Integrate transportation and environmental investments in a way that improves critical natural resources and supporting habitat.
2. Use a watershed-based approach to mitigation to ensure transportation related environmental funds are spent on the greatest environmental benefit.
3. Implement the Program in a manner that supports the Growth Management Act goals.

Mr. Cummings said the goals are still a draft; this is only the latest version. He said they are currently looking at strategies that deal with on or off-site mitigation that would not necessarily be adjacent to the improvement area. He said they are looking at a watershed-based approach.

Objectives: Natural Environment:

1. Avoid and minimize impacts to fish and wildlife and their habitat to the extent practicable and compensate for unavoidable impacts.
2. *Maintain, protect, and enhance the functions of fish and wildlife habitat, wetlands, and other waters of the state and to seek a net gain in those functions through preservation, restoration, creation, and enhancement.*
3. Adaptively manage mitigation sites. Design, implement, monitor, evaluate and adjust mitigation sites to ensure that defined standards are met.
4. *Establish and integrate into an agreement among project proponents and local, state and federal regulatory agencies an innovative mitigation strategy and schedule to protect environmental resources while ensuring transportation project delivery.*
5. *Maintain, protect, and improve air quality in the corridor and the region during construction and operation through:*
 - Innovative project design
 - Mitigation of construction related emissions, and
 - Measures such as transportation demand management, and fuel and technology improvements that reduce transportation related emissions of ozone precursors, particulate matter (PM10 & PM 2.5), toxic air pollutants, & carbon monoxide.
6. *Provide treatment for water quality and quantity for new impervious areas and as appropriate retrofit existing storm water outfalls, and participate in watershed-based storm water mitigation projects that would result in net improvements in the water quality and hydrology baselines in the affected watersheds.*
7. Protect sole source aquifers and minimize impacts to ground water.
8. Result in no net loss of wetland or floodplain area and function

Mr. Cummings said the EPA is very interested in the adaptive management that is in place right now. Mr. Springer asked how the program would both avoid and minimize. Mr. Cummings said it might avoid one affect and minimize others.

Mr. Mosher said someone could argue that it's all minimizing. However, if the program performs a transportation improvement, it will also be completing an environmental improvement in that area that otherwise would not be done. So, the I-405 program will be improving the existing environment. He said that it is worthwhile to collect information on this and emphasize it to the public and decision makers. He emphasized that if a project isn't done, the environmental degradation will continue. But if project is done, it will improve these areas. Mr. Mosher said that, in reality, the I-405 program can be an environmental benefit to the region and this point should be emphasized.

Chairman Kargianis said the I-90 improvements proved that water quality could be improved through a transportation project. Mr. Cummings said the issue is not whether the program will improve water, but the amount of improvement it will be accomplishing. He said that WSDOT would be meeting about this issue tomorrow.

Mr. Springer noted that there is nothing about noise in the objectives. Mr. Cummings said there is a separate effort for noise. He said staff knows it's an issue but will probably deal with mostly in the project level. He said the current message probably doesn't read very well so staff needs to work on this issue and would add the suggestion to the objectives in the next version. Mr. Mosher asked when the message would be clarified. Mr. Cummings said probably around the project level.

Chairman Kargianis asked if the program's noise mitigation policy isn't being heard or given. Mr. Cummings said that for the freeway elements, the first thing done when dealing with noise along the freeway is to install sound walls based on FHWA and WSDOT requirements. However, when meeting with neighborhood groups, they will say they already have sound walls but the noise is still getting worse because they live up the hill from the roadway. Mr. Cummings said that noise walls only help houses next to the wall, but if the houses are up the hill the noise increases because sound travels up. He said they need to talk about this issue among staff. He said this is the #1 issue from neighborhoods.

Chairman Kargianis asked if there's anything else the program could do besides installing sound walls. Mr. Cummings said staff would be talking about vegetation and other options. However, they don't know what the design will be in some locations yet. He said that residents want to know what's going to be done in their neighborhood, but staff doesn't know yet. Mr. Springer said staff should at least recognize the noise issue is documented.

Chairman Kargianis said people are suspicious that they won't have proper noise mitigation. He said it's essential to get the message out that the program will have a wide range of solutions. Mr. Dye said noise mitigation and expectations about noise mitigation are two different things. He said WSDOT will meet federal standards but standards only measure noise levels five feet above the improvement area. The standards don't require uphill mitigation. He said they would not be able to make everyone happy.

Chairman Kargianis asked what the program should say if a house isn't included in the basic regulations area. Mr. Putter said there is no current technology that will reduce the noise below federal standards. However, it is important to list noise mitigation as an issue while continuing to try and find solutions. But staff should also be realistic and candid. Mr. Cummings said staff would discuss this issue and come back with some information at the next meeting.

Mr. Cummings said staff has to deal with the whole scope of regional projects and how everything ties in together, in addition to the I-405 project.

Objectives: Built Environment:

1. *Avoid or minimize right of way impacts to residences and businesses by incorporating appropriate design/technologies.*
2. Use adaptive management techniques to monitor and adjust transportation improvements and schedules to achieve maximum benefits at lowest environmental and social costs.
3. Use advance mitigation to reduce the impacts of construction activities on mobility and the communities.

4. Locate and design transportation facilities to promote compact development and provide flexibility to serve future inter-modal needs.

5. Develop a project implementation program that will include as early actions:

- Transportation Demand Management
- Transit investments necessary to provide alternative means and routes for travel in the impacted sections
- Environmental Mitigation
- Targeted arterial investments

Mr. Cummings said they could expand #3 to talk about noise. He said #4 deals with how to get to and from transit stations.

Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue, said from that from the staff's perspective and in terms of the early mitigation effort, the project is taking on new territory. She said this project is an experiment and defines how to move through the NEPA process. She said that policy statements are critical in advancing the program's progressive environmental statement. The program needs early agreement to get through the process. However, she said that resource agencies are on the program's side, lessening the challenges. She warned staff to be careful when determining what agency is responsible for what action and remember that legislative streamlining bills are moving ahead at the same time. She said staff needs to define this new territory. She said that resource agencies are also short on staff and are having a hard time with the implications of the policy statements. She emphasized that the program is covering new ground and everyone has to be committed. She said that WIRA work shouldn't be diminished.

Chairman Kargianis said Ms. Becklund pointed out that agencies are limited on staff and this raises the risk that the program won't be able to move ahead because agencies can't get around to addressing it.

Ms. Becklund said she senses that WSDOT is working on this issue and working with the various groups to negotiate a system. However, they might require more resources. Some resource agencies aren't prepared for the decisions they have to make. Mr. Stone said that WSDOT has funded resource agencies in the past so that they can work on WSDOT projects. He said that mechanism could be put into place.

Mr. Mosher said that this system is a breakthrough on the ways to accomplish projects. He said that they might have to provide money for additional resource staff in order to get the project approved. He said that resource agencies are used to only reviewing the process, rather than being part of it.

Mr. Cummings said they are working with both resource agencies and tribes. He said WSDOT hasn't had a lot of communication with tribes yet, but are meeting with them and their staffs to understand their issues because they have primary fishing rights along the corridor. He said the program has been receiving fairly positive feedback to date.

Chairman Kargianis noted the committee's charter, detailing its roles and responsibilities, has been passed out. He said that if members have anything to add or edit they could talk about it at the next meeting. Ms. Brogan said the minor proposed revisions to the charter are included in the Power Point presentation for their reference.

Chairman Kargianis adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.